DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 919 HE 021 912

AUTHOR Low, Jane M.
TITLE The Davis Social Environment. A Report of Student Opinions.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE Aug 88
NOTE 37p.; For a related document, see HE 021 911.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Asian Americans; Blacks; College Environment; College Students; Community Relations; *Ethnic Groups; Extracurricular Activities; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Social Environment; Social Integration; Social Problems; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; *Student College Relationship; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

The perceptions of undergraduates regarding the social environment of the University of California-Davis campus are presented, based on a student opinion survey. The extent and nature of social integration among undergraduates is discussed, with a focus on whether the social environment differs among ethnic groups (Black, Chicano, Asian, and White). The four aspects of the social environment explored are: extracurricular activities; rules and regulations of student life; community relations; and social problems (health and well-being and intolerance on campus). Some of the major findings are as follows: undergraduates overall are well satisfied with most aspects of the campus' social environment; satisfaction level among ethnic groups vary considerably; Davis undergraduates are generally very pleased with extracurricular programs and services; students are moderately satisfied with the rules and regulations that govern student life; undergraduates overall report fairly high satisfaction with community relations on the Davis campus; Davis students overwhelmingly single out alcohol abuse as the most serious of the health and well-being problems; and student overall rate intolerance of homosexuality as a more serious problem for Davis students than racial intolerance (though this opinion is not shared by Blacks). Two appendices are persistence and graduation data and responses to individual questions. Tables showing measures of social integration are included. Contains 12 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299919

THE DAVIS SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

A Report of Student Opinions

Jane M. Low

Student Affairs Research and Information

University of California, Davis

August 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ of California Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 021 912

THE DAVIS SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

A Report of Student Opinions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study, based on the UC Davis Student Opinion Survey conducted in Spring 1987, examines the perceptions of undergraduate students regarding the social environment of the Davis campus.

The study identifies the following major findings:

- Undergraduates overall are well satisfied with most aspects of the campus' social environment.

- Satisfaction levels among ethnic groups, however, vary considerably. Black Students are substantially less satisfied than other students with nearly all aspects of the social environment, Whites and Asians are generally the most satisfied, while Chicanos fall between these extremes.

- Davis undergraduates are generally very pleased with extracurricular programs and services. They give an especially high rating to recreational and intramural programs. Black respondents, despite active participation, are among the least satisfied with extracurricular activities. In particular, they rate campus-sponsored social activities much lower than other students.

- Students are moderately satisfied with the rules and regulations that govern student life. Differences in satisfaction levels reported by ethnic groups are small, but again Blacks are the least satisfied group. They are especially dissatisfied with student voice in college policies and the purposes for which student activity fees are used. White students, on the other hand, are fairly critical of student government.

- Undergraduates overall report fairly high satisfaction with community relations on the Davis campus. They are very positive about the attitude of faculty toward students. Black students, however, are less satisfied than other students with all facets of social interaction on campus, particularly racial harmony, which received a disturbingly low rating. Although more satisfied than Blacks, Chicanos also give a relatively low rating to racial harmony on the Davis campus.

- Davis students overwhelmingly single out alcohol abuse as the most serious of the health and well-being problems addressed by the survey. Differences among the responses of different ethnic groups are small, suggesting that students generally share similar views on the problems of alcohol and drug abuse, sexual harassment, sexually transmitted diseases, and assaults on students.

- Students overall rate intolerance of homosexuality as a more serious problem for Davis students than racial intolerance. This opinion is not shared by Blacks and, to a lesser extent, by Chicanos; they perceive racial intolerance as a far more serious problem for Davis students than intolerance of homosexuality, foreign origin or disability.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary i

Introduction 1

Method 2

Extracurricular Activities 3

Rules and Regulations of Student Life 7

Community Relations 9

Social Problems 12
- Health and Well-Being
- Intolerance on Campus

Discussion 17

References 18

Appendix A A-1

Appendix B B-1

LIST OF TABLES

Measures of Social Integration

Table 1 Satisfaction with Extracurricular Activities 4
Table 2 Satisfaction with Rules and Regulations of Student Life 7
Table 3 Satisfaction with Community Relations 9
Table 4 Student Perceptions of Social Problems: Health and Well-Being 13
Table 5 Student Perceptions of Social Problems: Intolerance on Campus 15

INTRODUCTION

For over twenty years, UC Davis has sought to increase enrollment and graduation rates of students from ethnic groups underrepresented in the campus population (i.e., American Indians, Blacks, Chicanos, Filipinos and Latinos). The campus has, in fact, achieved significant progress by enrolling increasing numbers of these students although certain groups, particularly Blacks and Chicanos, continue to be underrepresented. An additional barrier remains: students from these groups persist and graduate at rates lower than those of others. About 66% of all freshmen entering between 1972 and 1982 completed a degree at Davis. But during this same period only 35% of American Indians, 39% of Blacks, 52% of Chicanos, 54% of Filipinos, and 59% of Latinos graduated from Davis; by comparison, 69% of Whites and 72% of Asians graduated. (See Appendix A for additional persistence data.)

In an effort to understand the factors influencing persistence and graduation, educational researchers have focused on students' satisfaction with their college environments. Perhaps most notable is Vincent Tinto [10], who has developed a theoretical model of institutional departure. He argues that withdrawal from an educational institution arises out of a longitudinal process of interactions between the student with a given background and expectations, and the academic and social systems of the college. Tinto postulates that the lower the degree of a student's integration into the academic and social communities of an institution, the greater the likelihood of departure. Conversely, the greater a student's integration, the greater the likelihood of persistence.

Researchers following Tinto's model have begun to explore the issue of how ethnicity interacts with the various factors influencing persistence. While some studies indicate that persistence for non-White students is strongly tied to academic integration [7, 2], others suggest that social integration also plays a very important role. Loo and Rolison [3] find that social alienation of non-White students in a predominately White institution is greater than that of Whites. Suen [8] demonstrates that departure for both White and Black students is related to academic variables, but that departure among Blacks is additionally due to feelings of social alienation. Pascarella's [5] study of persistence among Black and White students suggests that, for Black students, social integration may be equal to or even more important than academic integration as an influence on ultimate degree completion.

Do these findings apply to UC Davis? The answer is uncertain and imprecise; the factors influencing graduation rates are complex and unclear, and may well vary for each ethnic group. But the work of Tinto and others affirms the importance of examining the perceptions of individuals of different ethnic backgrounds regarding the social environment of the campus.

This report discusses the extent and nature of social integration among undergraduates on the Davis campus and seeks to determine whether satisfaction with the social environment differs among ethnic groups. It explores four aspects of the social environment: extracurricular activities, rules and regulations of student life, community relations, and social problems. As the following analysis shows, undergraduates overall are well satisfied with most aspects of the campus' social environment; however, the considerable differences in satisfaction among ethnic groups may well influence, at least in part, their respective persistence and graduation rates.[1]

[1] Respondent attitudes about the classroom environment and other aspects of academic life are discussed in *The Davis Academic Environment: A Report of Student Opinions*, Arthur K. Amos, Jr., Student Affairs Research & Information (May 1988). Respondent attitudes about pre-enrollment, academic and career advising are discussed in *Advising at UC Davis: A Report of Student Opinions*, Arthur K. Amos, Jr., Student Affairs Research & Information (March 1988).

METHOD

This study examines data from the UC Davis Student Opinion Survey, which was conducted in Spring 1987 by Student Affairs Research and Information. The survey used a questionnaire developed by the American College Testing Program (ACT), which asked respondents to provide opinions about a broad range of campus programs and services and to evaluate various aspects of the college environment. To it we added a set of campus-specific questions. Respondents also commented in response to the question: "What is your advice [to the new Chancellor] for strengthening UC Davis?"

Questionnaires were mailed to a stratified random sample of 1565 undergraduate, graduate and professional students, disproportionately selected by ethnicity and level. A second mailing to non-respondents followed four weeks later. The overall response rate was 51%; 801 students returned usable questionnaires. The following analysis uses responses weighted by ethnicity, gender, and class level so that survey groups are represented in proportion to their actual strength in the undergraduate population.[1]

This report examines survey results for undergraduates only; the population was divided by ethnicity into four groups for analysis:

SAA (Student Affirmative Action) groups:
- Black
- Chicano

Non-SAA groups:
- Asian
- White (includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities)

Other SAA groups (American Indian, Filipino and Latino) are excluded from this report because their numbers are too small to allow individual or independent analysis; Appendix B, however, includes statistical information about their response patterns to the survey questions discussed.

Several points should be kept in mind when reading this report. This research is a secondary analysis; the data were collected for purposes different from those used in the report. As a result, the operational definition of "social environment" is not as complete or as comprehensive as it might have been had the survey form been designed with this study in mind.

Also, only 35% of Black and 37% of Chicano participants returned survey forms; therefore caution should be used in extrapolating these findings to the entire Black and Chicano communities. Nevertheless, the 70 Black and 75 Chicano respondents represent sizable proportions of their populations (13% and 16% respectively).

The tables that follow use statistical means to compare individual ethnic groups with one another and with Davis undergraduates overall. Because these means were calculated using weighted data, it is not possible to identify statistically significant differences.

[1] A complete appendix on methodology is available upon request.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

The social experiences of college students include both formal extracurricular activities and informal day-to-day activities. Tinto [11] suggests that experiences in the informal social world of the campus are more likely than those in the formal social world to affect a student's social integration in college. Nevertheless, the campus expends considerable energy and money on formal activities so this section begins with an examination of student satisfaction with that side of the social environment at UC Davis.

Table 1 (page 4) displays the mean satisfaction ratings reported by undergraduate ethnic groups for each of eight extracurricular activities on the Davis campus. In addition, the table ranks the mean ratings for each ethnic group from low to high. For example, the mean satisfaction of Chicano students for recreational and intramural programs (4.63) is the highest rating given this program by any of the four ethnic groups considered herein.

Davis undergraduates overall report high levels of satisfaction with the extracurricular programs and services included in the study. This finding should be gratifying to those who organize and run these extracurricular activities. Students give a particularly high mean rating to recreational and intramural programs (4.49 on a scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied). Although religious activities and programs received the lowest satisfaction rating (3.42), it was nonetheless rated fairly positively.

Mean ratings reported by ethnic groups, however, differ considerably. Black respondents express substantially lower levels of satisfaction with nearly all extracurricular activities, while both Asian and White students report the highest levels of satisfaction. Chicano students fall between these extremes, rating some activities high and others low.

Black Students

For five of the eight extracurricular activities listed in Table 1, the ACT questionnaire additionally asked students whether they had "used this service." In these five activities, Black students participate fully and, with one exception, in proportions equal to or greater than those of Davis undergraduates overall:

	Participation Rates	
	Black	All
Food Services	91%	91%
Residence Hall Services & Programs	76%	71%
Cultural Programs	75%	38%
Recreational & Intramural Programs	70%	77%
UCD-Sponsored Social Activities	67%	58%

TABLE 1

Measures of Social Integration
Satisfaction with Extracurricular Activities

Rankings of Mean Rates by Ethnic Groups

	Satisfaction Rankings			
Programs & Services (Undergraduate Mean)	Least Satisfied	Middle		Most Satisfied
Recreational & Intramural Programs (4.49)	Black (4.25)	Asian (4.33)	White (4.54)	Chicano (4.63)
UCD-Sponsored Social Activities (3.87)	Black (3.46)	White (3.90)	Chicano (3.92)	Asian (4.00)
Opportunities for Personal Involvement in Campus Activities (3.85)	Black (3.62)	Chicano (3.78)	Asian (3.83)	White (3.89)
Residence Hall Services & Programs (3.83)	Chicano (3.65)	Black (3.68)	Asian (3.72)	White (3.90)
Cultural Programs (3.80)	Chicano (3.63)	Black (3.71)	Asian (3.73)	White (3.84)
Opportunities for Student Employment (3.76)	Chicano (3.47)	Black (3.49)	White (3.79)	Asian (3.83)
Food Services (3.51)	Chicano (3.29)	Black (3.30)	Asian (3.37)	White (3.58)
Religious Activities & Programs (3.42)	Black (3.07)	White (3.39)	Chicano (3.53)	Asian (3.69)

NOTE: Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.

Despite high levels of participation in these campus activities, Black students are the least satisfied of undergraduate ethnic groups with the activities shown in Table 1 above. In particular, they rate UCD-sponsored social activities (3.46) much lower than other students (Whites, 3.90; Chicanos, 3.92; Asians, 4.00). Comments from Black respondents suggest that this dissatisfaction may have more to do with the lack of activities rather than their quality. A senior remarked:

> Although Davis is an excellent school academically, the lack of social activities inhibits students from achieving the balance necessary for a good "college experience." Many people have told me of the loneliness they feel here at Davis, in spite of all the students, and most likely this is also due to a minimum amount of activities.

Another possible explanation is that the Black campus community has not reached the size necessary to provide enough informal social interaction. If this explanation is correct, it might be expected that Black students rely especially heavily on organized, formal activities for their social needs.

Chicano Students

Chicanos are more satisfied than other students with some extracurricular activities and less satisfied with others. Although they report the lowest use of recreational and intramural programs (60% versus 77% for all undergraduates), Chicano students express the highest level of satisfaction (4.63) for this activity. They are also among the most satisfied with UCD-sponsored social activities (3.92) and religious activities and programs (3.53).

However, Chicano students are least satisfied with food services (3.29), opportunities for student employment (3.47), cultural programs (3.63), and residence hall services and programs (3.65). For three of these services--food, student employment and residence halls there is little difference between Blacks and Chicanos; they are about equally dissatisfied. But Chicanos are even more dissatisfied than Blacks with cultural programs. The study did not investigate the causes of dissatisfaction with these services. Cultural differences between Black and Chicano students on the one hand and White students on the other may contribute to the lack of satisfaction, but a separate study would be needed to evaluate the validity of this explanation.

A Chicano senior urged campus administrators to provide more support for extracurricular activities:

> I suggest much more work in creating incentive and encouragement for student involvement in clubs and student organizations. I would like to see clubs having office space on a basis such as at UCLA and UC Berkeley. I have grown so much from my involvement in a student organization (MECHA) in terms of leadership skills and gaining a sense of social consciousness and responsibility. I also see my brothers, sisters, and friends at other UC campuses having so many more opportunities and campus support to develop themselves, enrich their campuses, and graduate with a much better preparation to positively influence the future.

Asian Students

Asians are among the most satisfied students with extracurricular activities. They indicate the highest levels of satisfaction with UCD- sponsored social activities (4.00), opportunities for student employment (3.83) and religious activities and programs (3.69). Asian respondents also give high ratings to opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities (3.83), cultural programs (3.73), residence hall services and programs (3.72) and food services (3.37).

Despite their general satisfaction with opportunities for student employment, several Asian respondents commented that student wages need to be increased. A senior described student wages on the Davis campus as "McDonald-like."

Finally, Asian respondents express almost as little satisfaction with recreational and intramural programs as do Blacks. The reasons for this are not clear.

White Students

Similar to Asians, White students are among the most satisfied with campus extracurricular activities. They are much more pleased than other respondents with residence hall services and programs (3.90) and with food services (3.58). Not only do four-fifths (79%) of White students participate in recreational and intramural programs, but they are very satisfied with this activity (4.54). They also give high satisfaction ratings to opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities (3.89), opportunities for student employment (3.79) and cultural programs (3.84).

For four of the eight extracurricular activities under discussion--social involvement, residence halls, cultural programs and food services--White students are the only group to report a higher mean level of satisfaction than the mean level reported by all undergraduates. And only for one--religious activities--do they report a lower mean level of satisfaction than the mean for all undergraduates. This pattern suggests a better fit with extracurricular activities for Whites at UC Davis than for other students.

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF STUDENT LIFE

Students' lives are influenced by rules and regulations established by campus administrative units (e.g., Student Housing and Student Judicial Affairs) and student government units (e.g., ASUCD).

The ACT questionnaire includes five items that relate to the issue of governance. As seen in Table 2, undergraduates overall are fairly satisfied with rules governing student conduct (3.64) and residence hall rules and regulations (3.40). But they express less satisfaction with the purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.22), student voice in college policies (3.18), and student government (3.12).

Although the various ethnic groups report varying levels of satisfaction, the differences among them are less for matters concerning rules and regulations than for other matters covered in this report.

TABLE 2

Measures of Social Integration
Satisfaction with Rules and Regulations of Student Life

Rankings of Mean Rates by Ethnic Groups

	Satisfaction Rankings			
Programs & Services (Undergraduate Mean)	Least Satisfied	Middle		Most Satisfied
Rules governing student conduct (3.64)	Black (3.42)	White (3.64)	Asian (3.67)	Chicano (3.79)
Residence hall rules & regulations (3.40)	Black (3.22)	Asian (3.33)	Chicano (3.39)	White (3.44)
Purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.22)	Black (3.00)	Chicano (3.17)	Asian (3.19)	White (3.25)
Student voice in college policies (3.18)	Black (3.01)	Chicano (3.13)	Asian (3.13)	White (3.20)
Student government (3.12)	White (3.05)	Black (3.16)	Chicano (3.23)	Asian (3.43)

NOTE: Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.

Black Students

Blacks, in general, report lower levels of satisfaction with governance than other students. They are least satisfied with the purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.00), student voice in college policies (3.01), residence hall rules and regulations (3.22), and rules governing student conduct (3.42).

Black students feel that campus administrators should seek greater input from them. One sophomore remarked, "I think the administration needs to stop guessing about what the students want and need and just ask them and follow through on their recommendations."

Chicano Students

Chicano students are among the most satisfied of ethnic groups with campus governance. They give high mean ratings to rules governing student conduct (3.79) and to residence hall rules and regulations (3.39) and student government (3.23). Somewhat lower ratings are reported for student voice in college policies (3.13) and the purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.17).

Several respondents, however, commented on the need for more open communication between students and administration, an attitude that they share with Black students. A sophomore suggested that campus administrators "listen to the people who know the students' problems best: the students themselves." A Chicano senior complained that the "administration is also very insensitive to student needs. They solicit very little student input for important issues and generally disregard it anyway."

Asian Students

Asian students are fairly satisfied with governance on the Davis campus. Student government, given lukewarm ratings by other ethnic groups, is viewed more positively by Asian students. Asian respondents also give high ratings to rules governing student conduct (3.67), the purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.19), and student voice in college policies (3.13).

White Students

White students are also generally satisfied with campus governance. Among respondents, they express higher levels of satisfaction with residence hall rules and regulations (3.44), the purposes for which student activity fees are used (3.25), and student voice in college policies (3.20).

They are, however, fairly critical of student government and give this aspect of campus governance the lowest mean rating (3.05). The comments offer little explanation as to why Whites are less satisfied than other students. A White senior suggested that "student government should be addressing real student issues," while a freshman commented:

> My biggest complaint concerns student government. I would like to know more about what is going on. I think the reason most students are apathetic about student government is because they don't know what is happening or what purpose it is serving.

COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Informal or personal relationships are essential to social integration in the college community and affect, to some extent, a student's persistence at that institution. As Tinto [11] put it, "The more frequent and rewarding interactions are between students and other members of the institution, the more likely are individuals to stay."

Four items from the ACT study, shown in Table 3 below, measure student satisfaction with community relations on the Davis campus. Undergraduates overall express a high level of satisfaction with the attitude of faculty toward students (3.82), slightly less satisfaction with racial harmony at UC Davis (3.44) and attitude of nonteaching staff toward students (3.41), and even less satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual (3.20).

TABLE 3

Measures of Social Integration
Satisfaction with Community Relations

Rankings of Mean Rates by Ethnic Groups

	Satisfaction Rankings			
Area of Social Contact (Undergraduate Mean)	Least Satisfied	Middle		Most Satisfied
Attitude of faculty toward students (3.82)	Black (3.61)	Chicano (3.78)	White (3.84)	Asian (3.91)
Racial harmony at this college (3.44)	Black (2.40)	Chicano (3.07)	White (3.51)	Asian (3.59)
Attitude of nonteaching staff toward students (3.41)	Black (3.35)	Asian (3.37)	Chicano (3.41)	White (3.42)
Concern for student as an individual (3.20)	Black (3.01)	White (3.20)	Chicano (3.23)	Asian (3.30)

NOTE: Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.

The picture changes dramatically, however, when one looks at satisfaction levels by ethnicity. Black students are less happy than other students with all facets of social interaction on campus, particularly racial harmony. Both Asian and White students are at the other end of the spectrum; for the most part, they are more satisfied with their social interactions on this campus. Chicano students appear in the middle.

Black Students

Black students rate satisfaction with their social relationships on this campus very low. Most disturbing is the great dissatisfaction Black students report with racial harmony at UC Davis. Their satisfaction rating (2.40) is more than one full point below that of all undergraduates (3.44). A Black freshman summed up the feelings of many Black students:

> I find it very hard for me, as an Afro-American, to assimilate in a predominantly white school and community. There are no social outlets for black people. At UCD there is too much racial tension. I would not suggest this school to another Afro-American person.

Respondents offered numerous suggestions for improving racial harmony among the members of the college community. A freshman wrote:

> Please increase the number of African-American students. This will give those African-American students presently here more of a social life and more of a sense of belonging.

Another commented that there should be "more ethnic and cultural events on campus for the ethnic students to participate in because we make up such a small part . . . of the campus." Said a junior: "I think the campus needs an ethnic awareness course mandatory for all incoming students. A very high percentage of students here have not been exposed to other cultures outside their own." Another respondent suggested "a need for more ethnic diversity among teaching staff." The comments of a senior represent the sentiments of many respondents:

> I think there needs to be a real commitment not just words, by the administration . . . to find and implement solutions. Student input should be sought, especially from third world and minority students whose voice is so often unheard, unsought and overlooked.

Black respondents also report a much lower level of satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual (3.01), a finding that possibly reflects their strong dissatisfaction with racial harmony at Davis. They additionally give the lowest satisfaction ratings to the attitudes of nonteaching staff toward students (3.35) and those of faculty (3.61).

Chicano Students

Although Chicano students appear more satisfied than Black students with their social interactions at Davis, they also give a relatively low mean rating to racial harmony on this campus (3.07). Chicano students' responses are similar to undergraduates overall regarding the attitude of the faculty toward students (3.78 versus 3.82), the attitude of nonteaching staff toward students (3.41 versus 3.41) and concern for the student as an individual (3.23 versus 3.20).

Several comments point up concern with racial harmony on this campus. In the words of a Chicano senior:

> There is definitely a problem with racial discrimination among the student body members. This issue is only a minor problem right now, but would be best dealt with now before it becomes something which may not be so easily controlled. Students need to become more aware of the cultural diversity in this community . . . and understand it rather than resent it.

A Chicano junior offered another perspective on this issue:

> There is a lack of ethnic Chicano faculty and role models on this campus. In addition there is a general atmosphere on this campus which has little tolerance or respect for people with diverse views. . . . The university needs to work on the retention of Chicano students and recruitment of Chicano faculty!

Asian Students

As measured by these ACT questions, Asian respondents are generally more satisfied than other students with personal interactions on the Davis campus. They report higher levels of satisfaction with the attitude of the faculty toward students (3.91), racial harmony at this college (3.59), and concern for the student as an individual (3.30).

Asian students, however, express somewhat less satisfaction with the attitude of the nonteaching staff toward students (3.37). A senior wrote:

> I appreciate my years at UC Davis, but I generally feel that the staff at this school should improve their attitude toward students and show more respect. Increased concern for students by university staff would lessen the "meat grinder" feeling of studying at a UC.

White Students

White students are, in general, well satisfied with their social relationships within the college community. This finding is not surprising. Despite the fact that non-White groups make up nearly a third (31%) of the undergraduate student body, UC Davis is perceived by many as a White, upper- middle-class university. A White freshman expressed these feelings: "I find Davis to be a very warm and comforting place to begin my college career." In contrast, a Black senior commented, "Davis is a good school to attend if you fit the norm. As an ethnic minority I felt under siege. This is not a comfortable environment for non-white-upper-middle-class people."

Compared with other ethnic groups on campus, White students give high mean ratings to the attitude of the nonteaching staff toward students (3.42), the attitude of the faculty toward students (3.84), and racial harmony at this college (3.51). They are less satisfied, however, than Asians or Chicanos with concern for the student as an individual (3.20).

White students are not oblivious to the concerns of other students. A junior commented: "Although I have never seen any direct racial problems I believe the student body is tacitly segregated. . . . Racism isn't a terrific problem, but we can improve our current situation." And another junior said:

> I think that racial harmony could definitely be improved. The white students on campus need a better understanding and awareness of the cultural richness of the ethnic community, while students of color need more support and involvement in/on the Davis campus.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Microcosms of society, colleges are not isolated from the social problems that trouble broader society. How the college handles such issues as alcohol and drug abuse and racial intolerance influence the perceptions of students regarding the social environment provided by that institution.

The survey included a set of nine questions specific to UC Davis that were used to measure social problems that occur at many colleges. Using a scale ranging from Not a Problem (1) to Serious Problem (4), respondents were asked to rate how much of a problem each area is for Davis students. The questions clustered around two themes: student health and well-being, and intolerance on campus.

I. Health and Well-Being

Alcohol abuse is one of the greatest health problems facing undergraduates at most American colleges and universities. Almost half (48%) the students at research universities say that alcohol is a serious problem on their campuses, according to The Carnegie Foundation's 1984 National Survey of Undergraduates [1]. Only 22 percent of Davis undergraduates agree with this statement, yet they overwhelmingly single out alcohol abuse as the most serious of the health and well-being problems included in this survey. (See Table 4 below.)

As with rules and regulations, the differences among the responses for different ethnic groups are small. This pattern suggests that students generally share similar views on the kinds of health and well-being problems addressed by the survey.

Black Students

Although students from all ethnic groups rate alcohol abuse as the most serious health problem for UC Davis undergraduates, Blacks are most likely to rate the problem as serious. Drug abuse on campus is considered by all ethnic groups as a somewhat less serious problem than alcohol abuse but,

In general, all ethnic groups rate such problems as sexual harassment, sexually transmitted diseases, and assaults on students as less serious for the campus than alcohol or drug abuse. However, Black respondents are among those most likely to report higher levels of concern for sexually transmitted diseases (1.89) and assaults on students (1.74).

The results of this study further show that Black students are among those least likely to rate sexual harassment as a serious problem for students at Davis (1.71).

TABLE 4

Measures of Social Integration
Student Perceptions of Social Problems: Health & Well-Being

Rankings of Mean Rates by Ethnic Groups

UC Davis Health & Well-Being (Undergraduate Mean)	Problem Rankings: More of a Problem	Middle		Less of a Problem
Alcohol abuse (2.68)	Black (2.82)	Chicano (2.78)	White (2.71)	Asian (2.50)
Drug abuse (1.90)	Black (2.07)	Chicano (2.06)	White (1.95)	Asian (1.66)
Sexual harassment (1.76)	Chicano (1.93)	White (1.79)	Black (1.71)	Asian (1.60)
Sexually transmitted diseases (1.74)	Chicano (1.96)	Black (1.89)	White (1.77)	Asian (1.57)
Assaults on students (1.69)	Chicano (1.79)	Black (1.74)	Asian (1.69)	White (1.69)

NOTE: Mean Ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.

Chicano Students

Overall, Chicanos report the greatest levels of concern for health and well-being issues on the Davis campus. They are the most likely of all ethnic groups to rate the problems of sexually transmitted diseases (1.96), sexual harassment (1.93) and assaults on students (1.79) as serious. A junior stated: "I feel that sexual harassment is the most serious problem on this campus." A senior, troubled by the potential for assault on campus, commented: "As far as personal security--where is it? If there is an escort service there should be more advertisement about it. This campus' trees are havens for rapists at night."

Chicano students are also very concerned with alcohol and drug abuse. The mean ratings reported by Chicanos for both problem areas are similar to those expressed by Black students: 2.78 for alcohol abuse and 2.06 for drug abuse.

Asian Students

Asian respondents are least likely to identify the measures of health and well-being on Table 4 as serious problems for UC Davis students. Their mean ratings are below those of all other ethnic groups: sexually transmitted diseases (1.57), sexual harassment (1.60), drug abuse (1.66), assaults on students (1.69) and alcohol abuse (2.50).

This finding may be related to the generally high levels of satisfaction for campus programs and services reported by Asian students. It may be that satisfied students are less likely than dissatisfied students to perceive problems as "serious" and that one source of discontent may heighten discontent in other, and apparently unrelated, areas.

White Students

White students generally rank in the middle of all ethnic groups when it comes to rating the seriousness of campus health and well-being problems. They give the following mean ratings to community problems: alcohol abuse (2.71), drug abuse (1.95), sexual harassment (1.79), sexually transmitted diseases (1.77) and assaults on students (1.69).

One respondent admonished campus administrators to look into drinking in fraternity houses:

> Alcohol abuse at UCD is rarely even noticed--except in fraternity houses. . . . I personally work in a local market where keg sales are dominated by frat houses. Fraternities have become alcoholic havens and I feel that UCD administration should make efforts to curb such behavior.

Another respondent expressed concern about sexual assaults on campus:

> Assaults, especially sexual assaults on women, are a big problem at UCD. I believe this problem could be helped if UCD would act responsibly and inform the students of incidents. There is a lack of student awareness regarding assaults occurring at UCD. It is vitally important that students become privy to this information and any future occurrences.

II. Intolerance on Campus

Many observers believe that racial intolerance is becoming more widespread on college campuses. Racial incidents at several American campuses made headlines during the 1987-88 school year. And yet, as shown in Table 5 below, Davis undergraduates rate intolerance of homosexuality as a more serious problem on campus than racial intolerance (2.01 versus 1.80 on a scale where 1 = No Problem and 4 = Serious Problem). Tables B-23 and B-25 in Appendix B provide further insight: almost one-third (31%) of all undergraduates think that intolerance of homosexuality is a Moderate or Serious Problem on the Davis campus, while less than one-fourth (22%) feel that racial intolerance is a Moderate or Serious Problem.

There is a striking disparity among ethnic groups regarding their perceptions of intolerance on the Davis campus. SAA students, particularly Blacks, are considerably more likely than non-SAA students to rate as serious those problem areas used in this study to assess intolerance.

Black Students

Black respondents report the greatest levels of concern on each measure of intolerance: race (2.90), homosexuality (2.63), foreign origin (2.28) and disability (1.82).

Although Blacks are more likely than other students to rate intolerance of homosexuality as a serious problem, they perceive racial intolerance as a far more serious problem for Davis students. Black respondents offered many comments relative to racial intolerance on this campus, some of which were

TABLE 5

Measures of Social Integration
Student Perceptions of Social Problems: Intolerance on Campus

Rankings of Mean Rates by Ethnic Groups

UC Davis Intolerance (Undergraduate Mean)	Problem Rankings: More of a Problem	Middle		Less of a Problem
Intolerance: homosexuality (2.01)	Black (2.63)	Chicano (2.05)	White (1.99)	Asian (1.93)
Intolerance: foreign origin (1.82)	Black (2.28)	Chicano (2.10)	Asian (1.80)	White (1.77)
Intolerance: race (1.80)	Black (2.90)	Chicano (2.21)	Asian (1.73)	White (1.70)
Intolerance: disability (1.40)	Black (1.82)	Chicano (1.59)	Asian (1.43)	White (1.35)

NOTE: Mean Ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.

cited above in the section on community relations. A comment written by a Black freshman expressed the feelings of many Blacks:

> The majority of students at Davis are very unaccepting of different cultures and backgrounds (i.e., race, financial background, disability and homosexuality). I think that this conservative attitude is due to the fact that many Davis students have never been exposed to different cultures.

The serious concern about racial intolerance reported by Black respondents--1.20 points higher than Whites and .69 higher that the next most concerned group, Chicanos--raises a question: Is it possible that this perceived racial intolerance is at the core of Black dissatisfaction on the campus?

Chicano Students

Although they indicate somewhat lower levels of concern than Blacks, Chicano students are nonetheless fairly concerned about intolerance on the Davis campus. They give the following mean ratings to intolerance issues: race (2.21), foreign origin (2.10), homosexuality (2.05) and disability (1.59).

Similar to Blacks, Chicanos perceive that racial intolerance is the most serious of these issues confronting Davis students. A Chicano senior offered this perspective on racial tension at UC Davis:

> Race problems are a serious issue. . . . the supposed parity of ethnic students to white students that was supposed to have happened through Student Affirmative Action has not taken place. Many minority students resent this, plus the attitudes of white students to those of us that have made it here; they act as if we were given a hand-out when in fact we also had to score in the top 10% to attend Davis.

Asian Students

Asian students, along with Whites, are less likely to rate as serious problems most measures of campus intolerance. Asian mean ratings for intolerance issues are: homosexuality (1.93), foreign origin (1.80), race (1.73) and disability (1.43).

Unlike SAA students, Asians rate intolerance of homosexuality and of foreign origin as more serious campus problems than racial intolerance. No Asian respondents commented on specific issues of intolerance, but a sophomore observed:

> I cannot help but notice that UC Davis seems to have a "narrow- minded" atmosphere. Students are unaware of the fact that many other students suffer prejudice, harassment, intimidation, and intolerance. This may not be the attitude of the administration, but doesn't the attitude of the campus reflect, somehow, the policies which exist?

White Students

In general, White students are least likely of all groups to rate as serious the issues used to assess intolerance on the Davis campus. They give relatively low mean ratings to intolerance of homosexuality (1.99), foreign origin (1.77), race (1.70) and disability (1.35).

As is the case with Asian students, Whites are more likely to rate intolerance of homosexuality and of foreign origin as more serious problems for the student community than racial intolerance. The differences between the perceptions of White and SAA students regarding racial intolerance on the Davis campus are quite striking. Only 17% of White students think that racial intolerance is a Moderate or Serious Problem for Davis students, whereas 72% of Blacks and 37% of Chicanos believe the problem to be Moderate or Serious (see Table B-25 in Appendix B).

DISCUSSION

The picture that emerges from this analysis of the social environment at UC Davis is clear: although undergraduates overall seem well satisfied with the campus' social environment, satisfaction levels among ethnic groups differ considerably. Blacks express substantially less satisfaction than other students with nearly all aspects of the social environment; Whites and Asians, on the other hand, generally express high levels of satisfaction; while Chicanos fall between.

The reasons for these differences in satisfaction are fairly clear. Both the numbers and comments suggest that Blacks, and to a lesser extent Chicanos, face greater problems than Asians or Whites in integrating into the social life of the Davis campus. Blacks are very dissatisfied with racial harmony at Davis; many commented that they feel socially isolated from what they perceive as a White, upper-middle-class college and community. Similar findings are reported in the literature. Tinto [11] asserts that non-White students generally and Blacks in particular often find it difficult to find and join a supportive community within an institution.

Less clear is the relationship between these findings on social integration and persistence or graduation rates for individual ethnic groups. The parallel patterns between graduation rates and satisfaction with the social environment at Davis are thought-provoking. Blacks, who have the lowest graduation rate, are also the least satisfied with the social environment. Asians and Whites, with the highest graduation rates, report the highest levels of social satisfaction. Chicanos rank in the middle on both graduation rates and satisfaction with the campus' social environment. (See Appendix A.)

Social integration is, however, only one aspect of the complex interaction of factors that influence students' decisions to persist or withdraw from an institution. Evidence in the literature indicates that academic integration is most certainly a key factor in persistence for all students [4, 6, 9]. But for some ethnic groups, social integration may be just as important a factor [5, 8, 12]. It is a matter of record that Black students as a group are more likely to enter Davis with lower academic qualifications, and a disturbingly low proportion (39%) of them will graduate from this institution. This study now provides evidence that Blacks are also less well integrated than other students into the campus' social system.

The relationships among satisfaction with the social environment, academic preparation, and persistence and degree completion are not clarified by these data. The data presented here only show that those students who, as a group, enter with relatively lower academic preparation and graduate in numbers fewer than their cohorts are also the least satisfied with the social environment at Davis. In designing future research on retention of these students and in evaluating support programs, consideration should be given to the possibility of an important relationship existing between satisfactory social integration and higher graduation rates. By improving the social integration of students from all ethnic groups, the campus may increase the likelihood that these students will persist in their studies and complete degrees here.

REFERENCES

1. Boyer, E. L. College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

2. Donovan, R. "Path Analysis of a Theoretical Model of Persistence in Higher Education among Low-Income Black Youth." Research in Higher Education, 21 (1984), 243-52.

3. Loo, C. M., and G. Rolison. "Alienation of Ethnic Minority Students at a Predominantly White University." Journal of Higher Education, 57 (1986), 58-77.

4. Pantages, T. J., and C. F. Creedon. "Studies of College Attrition: 1960-1975." Review of Educational Research, 48 (1978), 49-101.

5. Pascarella, E. T. "Racial Differences in Factors Associated with Bachelor's Degree Completion: A Nine-Year Follow-Up." Research in Higher Education, 23 (1985), 351-73.

6. Pascarella, E. T., and D. Chapman. "A Multiinstitutional, Path Analytic Validation of Tinto's Model of College Withdrawal." American Educational Research Journal, 20 (1983), 87-102.

7. Sedlacek, W., and D. Webster. "Admission and Retention of Minority Students in Large Universities." Journal of College Student Personnel, 19 (1978) 242-248.

8. Suen, H. K. "Alienation and Attrition of Black College Students on a Predominantly White Campus." Journal of College Student Personnel, 24 (1983), 117-21.

9. Terenzini, P. T., and E. T. Pascarella. "Voluntary Freshman Attrition and Patterns of Social and Academic Integration in a University: A Test of a Conceptual Model." Research in Higher Education, 6 (1977), 25-43.

10. Tinto, V. "Dropout from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research." Review of Educational Research, 45 (1975), 89-125.

11. _____. Leaving College. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

12. Tracey, T., and W. Sedlacek. "The Relationship of Noncognitive Variables to Academic Success: A Longitudinal Comparison by Race." Journal of College Student Personnel, 26 (1985), 405-10.

APPENDIX A

PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION DATA

PERSISTENCE AND GRADUATION RATES OF UC DAVIS DOMESTIC FRESHMEN
Summary of Fall Entrants by Ethnicity
1972-1982

Ethnic Status	Number Enrolled	Minimum Number of Quarters Enrolled (by percent) 4 Quarters	7 Quarters	10 Quarters	Percent Graduated
American Indian	178	73%	54%	46%	35%
Black	985	81	62	53	39
Chicano	713	82	71	61	52
Filipino	304	89	76	67	54
Latino	379	84	72	63	59
All SAA	2,559	82	67	58	47
Asian	2,620	92	82	77	72
White	20,306	89	78	71	69
All Domestic Freshmen	26,935	88	77	70	66

Source: Student Affairs Research and Information, extracted from the Composite Undergraduate File (CUF-87F).

APPENDIX B

RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

The following tables report the responses to individual questions dealing with the social environment at UC Davis. These tables use weighted data so that individual responses are assigned a weight corresponding to the individual's representedness in the UC Davis student population by ethnicity, gender, and class level.

Table B-1	Recreational and Intramural Programs
Table B-2	UCD-Sponsored Social Activities
Table B-3	Opportunities for Personal Involvement in Campus Activities
Table B-4	Residence Hall Services and Programs
Table B-5	Cultural Programs
Table B-6	Opportunities for Student Employment
Table B-7	Food Services
Table B-8	Religious Activities and Programs
Table B-9	Rules Governing Student Conduct
Table B-10	Residence Hall Rules and Regulations
Table B-11	Purposes for Which Student Activity Fees Are Used
Table B-12	Student Voice in College Policies
Table B-13	Student Government
Table B-14	Attitude of Faculty Toward Students
Table B-15	Racial Harmony at This College
Table B-16	Attitude of Nonteaching Staff Toward Students
Table B-17	Concern for Student as an Individual
Table B-18	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Alcohol Abuse?
Table B-19	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Drug Abuse?
Table B-20	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Sexual Harassment?
Table B-21	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Sexually Transmitted Diseases?
Table B-22	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Assaults on Students?
Table B-23	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance: Homosexuality?
Table B-24	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance: Foreign Origin?
Table B-25	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance: Race?
Table B-26	How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance: Disability?

TABLE B-1
RECREATIONAL AND INTRAMURAL PROGRAMS

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
All Undergraduates	52.1%	44.6%	2.9%	0.4%	0.0%	*4.49*	76.6%
SAA Undergraduates:							
Blacks	30.5	66.3	1.4	1.8	0.0	*4.25*	69.7
Chicanos	62.6	37.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	*4.63*	59.9
Other SAA[1]	36.6	59.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	*4.32*	70.5
Non-SAA Undergraduates:							
Asians	36.1	62.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	*4.33*	73.2
Whites[2]	57.5	38.9	3.6	0.0	0.0	*4.54*	79.1
National Norms	32.2	53.3	9.4	4.0	1.0	*4.12*	52.8

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 72.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-2
UCD-SPONSORED SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
All Undergraduates	18.0%	57.5%	18.8%	5.4%	0.4%	*3.87*	57.7%
SAA Undergraduates:							
Blacks	8.4	40.5	41.9	7.7	1.5	*3.46*	67.4
Chicanos	20.2	55.2	20.6	4.0	0.0	*3.92*	67.5
Other SAA[1]	10.0	45.7	36.0	3.3	5.0	*3.52*	58.1
Non-SAA Undergraduates:							
Asians	19.6	60.3	20.0	0.0	0.0	*4.00*	47.3
Whites[2]	18.8	59.1	15.5	6.6	0.0	*3.90*	59.1
National Norms	14.1	55.4	22.8	6.0	1.7	*3.74*	55.3

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 51.1% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-3
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN CAMPUS ACTIVITIES

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	18.4%	53.2%	24.7%	2.5%	1.1%	*3.85*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	6.4	60.7	23.1	7.7	2.0	*3.62*
Chicanos	19.5	41.5	36.6	2.4	0.0	*3.78*
Other SAA[1]	12.0	53.7	30.0	3.1	1.2	*3.72*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	16.6	51.1	30.6	1.7	0.0	*3.83*
Whites[2]	20.0	53.9	22.4	2.4	1.3	*3.89*
National Norms	12.9	49.2	29.8	6.4	1.6	*3.65*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 91.9% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-4
RESIDENCE HALL SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
All Undergraduates	20.7%	52.9%	17.6%	7.0%	1.9%	*3.83*	70.9%
SAA Undergraduates:							
Blacks	10.0	59.1	22.4	5.7	2.7	*3.68*	75.8
Chicanos	23.0	43.0	18.1	8.1	7.8	*3.65*	67.2
Other SAA[1]	15.1	48.8	19.1	12.8	4.2	*3.58*	67.3
Non-SAA Undergraduates:							
Asians	17.8	42.7	33.0	6.5	0.0	*3.72*	76.7
Whites[2]	22.4	56.0	13.1	6.7	1.8	*3.90*	69.8
National Norms	13.1	51.2	22.5	9.8	3.4	*3.61*	51.4

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 58.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-5
CULTURAL PROGRAMS

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
All Undergraduates	18.6%	52.8%	21.2%	5.0%	2.3%	*3.80*	37.8%
SAA Undergraduates:							
Blacks	29.0	32.8	18.5	19.6	0.0	*3.71*	75.0
Chicanos	18.2	40.9	28.7	9.8	2.4	*3.63*	47.4
Other SAA[1]	15.3	67.7	9.6	5.5	1.9	*3.89*	51.6
Non-SAA Undergraduates:							
Asians	9.9	56.6	29.9	3.6	0.0	*3.73*	42.4
Whites[2]	20.5	53.2	19.8	3.1	3.4	*3.84*	33.0
National Norms	22.3	55.9	17.3	3.4	1.1	*3.95*	26.3

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 35.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-6
OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	15.8%	50.7%	28.4%	3.4%	1.7%	*3.76*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	7.2	51.3	28.1	9.8	3.6	*3.49*
Chicanos	11.7	34.3	44.5	8.4	1.2	*3.47*
Other SAA[1]	11.2	48.3	29.2	7.4	4.0	*3.55*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	8.7	67.2	22.5	1.6	0.0	*3.83*
Whites[2]	18.7	48.1	28.7	2.8	1.7	*3.79*
National Norms	7.4	36.8	39.1	12.9	3.8	*3.31*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 81.9% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-7
FOOD SERVICES

	Level of Satisfaction						
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating	Percent Using Service
All Undergraduates	12.0%	47.2%	23.9%	13.0%	3.9%	*3.51*	91.4%
SAA Undergraduates:							
Blacks	4.3	44.6	33.0	12.4	5.7	*3.30*	90.6
Chicanos	5.7	48.3	26.0	9.4	10.7	*3.29*	92.3
Other SAA[1]	9.9	38.1	32.0	13.8	6.2	*3.32*	89.8
Non-SAA Undergraduates:							
Asians	9.5	44.8	24.5	15.7	5.5	*3.37*	93.5
Whites[2]	13.6	48.7	22.4	12.4	2.9	*3.58*	91.0
National Norms	7.3	38.3	26.3	19.0	9.1	*3.16*	76.6

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 85.3% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-8
RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	7.8%	30.3%	58.4%	3.2%	0.4%	*3.42*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	1.6	22.9	58.7	14.2	2.5	*3.07*
Chicanos	11.8	40.9	38.1	7.0	2.1	*3.53*
Other SAA[1]	5.1	16.1	72.2	4.0	2.5	*3.17*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	10.0	48.5	41.5	0.0	0.0	*3.69*
Whites[2]	7.6	26.6	62.9	2.9	0.0	*3.39*
National Norms	8.0	35.3	51.8	3.6	1.3	*3.45*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 62.6% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-9
RULES GOVERNING STUDENT CONDUCT

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	8.2%	55.5%	30.6%	3.9%	1.8%	*3.64*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	6.2	47.5	28.4	18.0	0.0	*3.42*
Chicanos	5.5	70.5	21.6	2.4	0.0	*3.79*
Other SAA[1]	10.4	52.3	31.8	4.9	0.7	*3.67*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	6.7	58.2	31.9	1.7	1.4	*3.67*
Whites[2]	8.6	54.9	30.8	3.6	2.1	*3.64*
National Norms	6.2	44.0	37.6	8.7	3.5	*3.41*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 93.1% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-10
RESIDENCE HALL RULES AND REGULATIONS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	8.6%	44.2%	29.3%	13.9%	4.0%	*3.40*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	1.2	41.8	36.4	19.5	1.2	*3.22*
Chicanos	5.2	49.4	30.5	8.5	6.3	*3.39*
Other SAA[1]	7.2	40.7	30.7	11.8	9.7	*3.24*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	10.6	43.7	23.8	12.4	9.7	*3.33*
Whites[2]	9.0	44.4	30.0	14.4	2.2	*3.44*
National Norms	6.2	38.6	31.9	16.0	7.3	*3.20*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 65.3% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-11
PURPOSES FOR WHICH STUDENT ACTIVITY FEES ARE USED

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	2.8%	35.6%	45.1%	13.9%	2.6%	*3.22*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	1.9	30.2	35.4	30.4	2.0	*3.00*
Chicanos	2.0	34.3	45.6	14.8	3.3	*3.17*
Other SAA[1]	1.9	33.7	46.1	14.1	4.2	*3.15*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	2.0	29.5	55.6	10.9	2.0	*3.19*
Whites[2]	3.2	37.7	43.1	13.5	2.6	*3.25*
National Norms	3.3	26.5	40.0	20.4	9.8	*2.93*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 93.3% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-12
STUDENT VOICE IN COLLEGE POLICIES

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	4.7%	30.2%	47.9%	13.0%	4.2%	*3.18*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	4.3	26.9	37.1	29.1	2.6	*3.01*
Chicanos	1.1	37.0	40.3	16.9	4.7	*3.13*
Other SAA[1]	3.5	35.9	47.9	8.4	4.3	*3.26*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	5.8	22.8	54.4	12.6	4.3	*3.13*
Whites[2]	4.8	31.4	47.5	12.2	4.2	*3.20*
National Norms	3.3	25.1	47.6	16.6	7.4	*3.00*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 88.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-13
STUDENT GOVERNMENT

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	2.9%	28.3%	51.7%	12.1%	5.0%	*3.12*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	4.7	16.7	71.1	4.6	3.0	*3.16*
Chicanos	4.5	27.0	58.2	7.6	2.7	*3.23*
Other SAA1	4.3	21.3	56.5	9.7	8.2	*3.04*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	6.3	42.3	42.3	5.9	3.1	*3.43*
Whites2	1.9	26.5	51.9	14.3	5.4	*3.05*
National Norms	3.9	30.2	51.0	9.8	5.0	*3.18*

1Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
2Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 85.4% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-14
ATTITUDE OF FACULTY TOWARD STUDENTS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	17.0%	57.8%	17.4%	5.9%	1.8%	*3.82*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	7.3	59.2	22.3	9.9	1.3	*3.61*
Chicanos	14.2	56.7	23.1	5.0	1.0	*3.78*
Other SAA1	7.1	55.7	25.2	9.1	2.9	*3.55*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	15.7	60.8	21.9	1.6	0.0	*3.91*
Whites2	18.9	57.3	15.1	6.4	2.2	*3.84*
National Norms	20.8	50.1	20.0	7.4	1.7	*3.81*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 98.7% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-15
RACIAL HARMONY AT THIS COLLEGE

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	8.3%	46.8%	29.2%	11.8%	3.8%	*3.44*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	0.8	8.6	40.5	30.2	19.9	*2.40*
Chicanos	7.2	31.4	31.5	21.2	8.8	*3.07*
Other SAA1	7.0	37.8	29.3	19.3	6.7	*3.19*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	9.0	54.3	26.4	7.3	2.9	*3.59*
Whites[2]	8.8	48.9	29.1	10.7	2.6	*3.51*
National Norms	7.9	45.7	32.4	9.9	4.0	*3.44*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.1% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-16
ATTITUDE OF NONTEACHING STAFF TOWARD STUDENTS

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	6.6%	47.5%	30.9%	10.4%	4.7%	*3.41*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	5.1	43.6	35.9	11.8	3.6	*3.35*
Chicanos	9.7	41.9	32.6	10.8	5.0	*3.41*
Other SAA[1]	8.9	38.6	37.7	13.7	1.1	*3.41*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	2.2	43.8	45.0	6.8	2.2	*3.37*
Whites[2]	7.3	49.6	26.5	10.9	5.6	*3.42*
National Norms	7.1	39.8	35.0	12.2	5.9	*3.30*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 95.6% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-17
CONCERN FOR STUDENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL

	Level of Satisfaction					
	Very Satisfied 5	Satisfied 4	Neutral 3	Dissatisfied 2	Very Dissatisfied 1	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	6.3%	33.7%	39.1%	16.1%	4.9%	*3.20*
SAA Undergraduates:						
Blacks	4.5	21.3	47.1	24.9	2.2	*3.01*
Chicanos	7.2	32.4	41.7	13.1	5.6	*3.23*
Other SAA[1]	6.3	28.9	33.3	29.0	2.6	*3.07*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:						
Asians	3.0	43.9	36.5	13.8	2.9	*3.30*
Whites[2]	7.1	32.4	39.7	15.1	5.6	*3.20*
National Norms	6.1	32.1	36.1	17.9	7.8	*3.11*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 97.5% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-18
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS ALCOHOL ABUSE?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	13.6%	26.9%	37.2%	22.3%	*2.68*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	12.5	24.8	30.7	32.1	*2.82*
Chicanos	13.3	25.1	31.6	30.0	*2.78*
Other SAA[1]	16.3	22.5	41.1	20.1	*2.65*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	16.6	40.1	20.0	23.2	*2.50*
Whites[2]	12.8	24.4	41.5	21.4	*2.71*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-19
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS DRUG ABUSE?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	35.3%	43.3%	17.2%	4.3%	*1.90*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	26.4	47.6	18.9	7.1	*2.07*
Chicanos	36.1	32.0	22.2	9.7	*2.06*
Other SAA[1]	36.3	41.5	19.4	2.7	*1.88*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	50.2	39.3	5.2	5.3	*1.66*
Whites[2]	32.2	44.7	19.4	3.7	*1.95*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.4% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-20
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS SEXUAL HARASSMENT?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	41.7%	42.8%	13.1%	2.4%	*1.76*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	45.9	38.6	14.2	1.3	*1.71*
Chicanos	37.5	41.5	11.9	9.1	*1.93*
Other SAA[1]	42.8	31.7	22.4	3.1	*1.86*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	48.5	43.9	6.2	1.4	*1.60*
Whites[2]	39.9	43.8	14.0	2.3	*1.79*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.4% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-21
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS SEXUALLY TRANSMITTED DISEASES?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	44.2%	42.3%	9.0%	4.6%	*1.74*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	42.6	32.0	19.0	6.3	*1.89*
Chicanos	34.1	41.9	17.4	6.6	*1.96*
Other SAA[1]	51.1	36.3	8.5	4.1	*1.66*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	52.2	40.6	5.7	1.6	*1.57*
Whites[2]	42.3	43.8	8.8	5.1	*1.77*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 94.8% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-22
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS ASSAULTS ON STUDENTS?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	47.4%	39.3%	10.1%	3.3%	*1.69*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	48.5	32.8	14.5	4.2	*1.74*
Chicanos	36.4	48.6	15.1	0.0	*1.79*
Other SAA[1]	57.1	29.2	8.8	4.9	*1.61*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	56.0	23.1	17.2	3.7	*1.69*
Whites[2]	45.0	43.8	8.0	3.1	*1.69*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.4% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-23
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE: HOMOSEXUALITY?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	38.3%	30.2%	23.8%	7.6%	*2.01*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	13.9	33.5	28.0	24.7	*2.63*
Chicanos	28.8	42.9	22.7	5.6	*2.05*
Other SAA[1]	40.0	27.9	22.6	9.5	*2.02*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	45.7	25.3	19.3	9.7	*1.93*
Whites[2]	38.3	30.7	24.8	6.1	*1.99*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 97.0% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-24
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE: FOREIGN ORIGIN?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	44.4%	33.9%	16.8%	4.9%	*1.82*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	17.6	47.3	24.0	11.0	*2.28*
Chicanos	29.6	39.3	22.3	8.7	*2.10*
Other SAA[1]	37.6	33.0	20.1	9.3	*2.01*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	51.0	22.2	22.3	4.5	*1.80*
Whites[2]	45.7	35.7	14.6	4.0	*1.77*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.9% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-25
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE: RACE?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	47.6%	30.6%	15.5%	6.2%	*1.80*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	6.8	21.6	46.1	25.5	*2.90*
Chicanos	27.8	34.7	25.9	11.6	*2.21*
Other SAA[1]	33.0	28.3	26.0	12.6	*2.18*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	57.1	22.6	10.6	9.7	*1.73*
Whites[2]	50.0	33.0	13.4	3.5	*1.70*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.7% of respondents answered this question.

TABLE B-26
HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE: DISABILITY?

	Severity of Problem				
	Not a Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	Mean Rating
All Undergraduates	66.5%	27.4%	5.5%	0.7%	*1.40*
SAA Undergraduates:					
Blacks	45.2	32.4	18.0	4.4	*1.82*
Chicanos	59.1	27.0	9.2	4.7	*1.59*
Other SAA[1]	58.7	30.9	8.6	1.8	*1.54*
Non-SAA Undergraduates:					
Asians	63.3	31.6	3.5	1.6	*1.43*
Whites[2]	69.5	25.8	4.7	0.0	*1.35*

[1]Includes American Indians, Filipinos and Latinos.
[2]Includes White, East Indian/Pakistani and Other ethnicities.

NOTE: 96.4% of respondents answered this question.